

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Dox 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/042,525		10/19/2001	Eric K. Larson	04513-023001	7279	
26161	7590	07/16/2003				
FISH & RI		SON PC	EXAMINER			
225 FRANI BOSTON, I		0	FRANK, RODNEY T			
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2856		
				DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)	
Advis ry Action	10/042,525	LARSON ET AL.	(/)
Advis Ty Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rodney T. Frank	2856	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the c v r sheet with th	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 06 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriation of the fee. The appropriation of the final the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consi	idered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>12-16</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-11 and 1</u>	7-21 .		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	proved by the Exami	ner.
$9. \boxtimes$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	nt(s)(PTO-1449)	<u>4</u> .	
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>			



Continuation of 10. Other: The applicant argues that since the Staerzl reference is more "involved" than the present invention, then it does not read on the claims as presented. The examiner disagrees as a closer reading of Staerzl describes, in column 3 lines 12-36, the complete operation of the device. It states that when adequate oil is flowing in the system, the temperature at the downstream sensor will be greater than the temperature at the upstream sensor and the resistance should be less at the downstream sensor than the upstream sensor. If the oil has stopped, however, the resistance will be approximately equal. The circuit then compares the resistance of the two sensors to determine adequate flow. With this in mind, then the temperature/resistance fo the upstream sensor would serve as the threshold by which the downstream sensor is compared, and thus would still disclose a sensing circuit comprising elemetric connected to determine a change in voltage across the thermistor, and comparign that change to a threshold. The examiner feels that the rejection is therefore valid.

Also, at the applicants request, there is another copy of the form 1449 where document AQ has been initialed indicating it's review.

HEZRON WILLIAMS

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800